

Duval County Public Schools

Hospital And Homebound



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hospital And Homebound

1128 BARBER ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

<http://www.duvalschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Mark Ertel

Start Date for this Principal: 9/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	24%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hospital And Homebound

1128 BARBER ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

<http://www.duvalschools.org>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Special Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

<p>Year</p> <p>Grade</p>		<p>2014-15</p> <p>I*</p>
--	--	---------------------------------

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a compassionate individualized approach dedicated to student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ertel, Mark	Principal	
Macy, Matthew	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	1	6	8	3	2	5	3	12	11	14	8	9	14	96
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	3	1	4	2	8	13	15	18	15	14	1	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2	3	2	1	5	5	5	12	11	9	6	5	0	66

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	7	0	1	3	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	9	6	0	32
Students retained two or more times	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	9	1	1	30

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/12/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	3	1	3	3	3	11	8	13	13	13	4	1	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	3	2	0	3	4	4	10	4	6	7	6	3	1	53

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	2	3	3	3	3	9	5	6	7	6	2	0	52

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	54%	61%	0%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	54%	0%	47%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	57%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	57%	59%	0%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	46%	50%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	0%	50%	56%	0%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	78%	0%	76%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	1 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	12 (0)	11 (0)	14 (0)	8 (0)	9 (0)	14 (0)	96 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 ()	4 ()	3 ()	1 ()	4 ()	2 ()	8 ()	13 ()	15 ()	18 ()	15 ()	14 ()	1 ()	102 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2 ()	3 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	12 (0)	11 (0)	9 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	66 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	7%	44%	-37%	52%	-45%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	51%	-51%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	40%	49%	-9%	56%	-16%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		40%				
Cohort Comparison		40%				
09	2019	47%	48%	-1%	55%	-8%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		47%				
Cohort Comparison		47%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-45%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	21%	47%	-26%	54%	-33%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	31%	-31%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	40%	-40%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	67%	-22%	67%	-22%
2018	73%	63%	10%	65%	8%
Compare		-28%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	84%	-84%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	68%	5%	70%	3%
2018	0%	64%	-64%	68%	-68%
Compare		73%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	42			31							
BLK				20							
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	21
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	63
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	71%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
--	--

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

7th grade ELA. Contributing factors include: fluidity of the migrant nature of admission to the program.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Biology. Factors that contributed: an increase in enrollment at residential facility whose control of student time and access is a limitation.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

7th grade ELA. Contributing factors include: fluidity of the migrant nature of admission to the program.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

N/A as there is no prior year data.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Attendance
2. Participation with virtual learning and online tutoring.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Federal Index - Black/African American Students
Rationale	Our students are constantly changing every year by entering and exiting at different times of the year. Some of our African American Students need additional layers of support based on the federal index percentage.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Prior year was 37%. Current year focus it to reach 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matthew Macy (macym@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Helping students in goal setting and a personal reward system.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Improve student self-confidence and instill self-worth.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create the Virtual learning lab access on a scheduled basis. 2. Ensure that the BlackBoard sessions for individual/group instruction is available at multiple times per week. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Matthew Macy (macym@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Federal Index - Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Due to the migrant student population related to their temporary disability of illness or incapacitation, the students are all assigned ESE status for the period of time assigned to the school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Prior year was 37%. Current year focus it to reach 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	One-on-one instructional support using blended learning model and online tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy increases the opportunity for an ill/incapacitated student to have direct interaction with a teacher for direct instruction when personal contact is not an option.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create the Virtual learning lab access on a scheduled basis. 2. Ensure that the BlackBoard sessions for individual/group instruction is available at multiple times per week. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Matthew Macy (macym@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).